

Stormwater Stakeholders Meeting

Pine Tree State Arboretum

July 14, 2003

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Meeting Summary

Introductions - Name and affiliation

Overview of meeting agenda – Anne Gosline

Summary of Technical Sub-Group meeting - Don Witherill

Don summarized the discussion that had taken place at the technical sub-group meeting. (see attached meeting summary)

- Q.** Will a revised proposal on quantity standards be brought back to the full stakeholders group?

A. Yes, a draft will be brought back after working further with the technical sub-group.
- Q.** Will the technical sub-group be meeting again?

A. Yes (Post meeting note: the technical group met on July 23rd and is scheduled to meet again on August 21st.)
- Q.** What is the meaning of extended detention?

A. Extended detention is the process of holding runoff water for a specified period of time and the letting it drain slowly instead of all at once.
- Q.** Why is a change in the design storm, from a 25 year storm to a 10 year storm, being contemplated?

A. Concern was expressed at Technical Work Group meeting that the 10 year storm occurs more frequently and should be included in design standards. While it was implied that the 10 year storm be used instead of the 25 year storm, upon further consideration, DEP engineers recommend that both the 10 year and 25 year storms be maintained in the standards. Presently, the stormwater management law requires that the flow from a 2, 10 and 25-year storm be controlled.

Stormwater Quantity Issues – Rich Claytor

Rich Claytor gave a presentation on quantity issues.

There is a movement in the Pacific Northwest to incorporate source controls (low-impact development, floodplain expansion, channel protection, maintaining base-flow, improved site design, etc.) into the standards.

Stream channel protection – changes in hydrology cause channel widening, bank erosion, loss of habitat, etc.

Erosion starts at about 1/3 bankfull.

The 1-year storm, released over 24 hours works best for warmwater fish habitat. The 1-year storm, released over 12 hours works best for coldwater fish habitat. The 1-year, 24 hour release is probably the best case scenario without doing a site-assessment.

The SCS model does not work well for storms of less than two inches. It is really intended to be a flood control plan. It may over-estimate large storms by as much as 25%. It is a good model for flood control but needs modifications for small storms.

Fifteen to twenty percent impervious cover is where you start to see significant change to a stream channel.

Next steps – Quantity

The quantity standards will be discussed at the next technical sub-group meeting. Any conclusions reached at that meeting will be brought back to the larger group.

Overview of “big picture” questions re: quality standards

Don – Phase II didn't deal with post-construction. The Federal Clean Water Act and Maine's waste discharge law prohibit a discharge that would cause or contribute to any water quality violation. This is an issue that the stakeholder group agreed last year to look at in this second round of discussions. The issue is how new development can meet this requirement when the project site drains to a water impaired due to urban runoff.

Stormwater Quality Issues – Rich Claytor

Water quality issues are handled in various ways in other states. The most simplistic quality standard is a presumption that you meet the water quality criteria if you do certain things. In Maryland, if you design stormwater facilities using specific approved BMPs, you are assumed to meet the standards. In Vermont, you are presumed to meet the standards of 80% TSS and 40% phosphorus if you meet the standards. In the New York City watershed, you must prove that there will be no net increase in the pollutant load. In the Chesapeake Bay watershed, detention ponds can be given different ratings depending on what storm it is sized for. There can also be detention ponds in a series.

Regulating existing loads, as well as new loads, may be the only way to not increase a watershed's load. Question was asked, doesn't that

contribute to sprawl? Rich stated that from his experience, that doesn't happen with commercial development. It is a possibility for residential development.

A concern was raised about detention ponds. Detention ponds are an important BMP, but they are not always appropriate. BMPs will and should vary depending on the watershed.

A question was raised as to whether or not manufactured systems should be required to be independently tested and rated. Rich feels that this is a good approach.

Question about the remaining 20% TSS, if the 80% removal level is used. 85% to 90% is probably the maximum removal that is possible.

Need to remember that protection of a resource is easier than restoration.

What about BMP maintainance? Almost all states have maintainance provisions in their regulations. BMP maintainance varies widely depending on BMPs used.

Next steps – Quality

Issues to be sent to the technical group:
Approval of manufactured BMPs
Infiltration
Compact area BMPs

Priority topics for upcoming meetings

Impaired watersheds (meeting CWA regulations)
Regulation of existing development
Post-construction maintainance
Credits/Trading provisions
Funding

Next Meeting

DEP will prepare information on TMDLs for the next meeting, including what it is, how is one prepared, schedule for impaired streams, etc.

The next meeting will be held on August 13, 2003 at the Prince of Peace Church in Augusta (site of meeting #2). Another meeting is scheduled for September 5, 2003 with the location for that meeting to be announced.